DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 377 330 CE 067 752

TITLE	Student Assessment in Michigan's Adult Volunteer Literacy Programs.
INSTITUTION	Michigan Literacy, Inc., Lansing.
SPONS AGENCY	Michigan State Jobs Commission, Lansing.
PUB DATE	Nov 94
NOTE	54p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Michigan Litracy, Inc., P.O. Box 30007, Lansing, MI 48909-7507.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; *Adult Literacy; Educational Resources; *Evaluation Methods; *Literacy Education; *Student Evaluation; *Tests; Tutors; Volunteers
IDENTIFIERS	*Michigan

ABSTRACT

Michigan Literacy conducted a project to collect, review, summarize, and compile a reference document of all student assessment tools currently being used by adult volunteer literacy programs in Michigan. Data were gathered through a survey questionnaire that was sent to 134 volunteer literacy programs (with 82 responses). Respondents reported that they used 40 different assessment instruments to determine suitable materials for students, to place students appropriately, to assess student progress, to make recommendations, and to identify student areas of difficulty. In addition, relevant literature was reviewed to identify current research and development on adult student assessment tools specifically designed for use in volunteer literacy programs. A resource list and the summary of the literature were provided to assist programs in identifying student assessment methods best suited to their students' and their programs' objectives. Eleven assessment tools were noted as being used in various Michigan programs, with contact persons and telephone numbers given for each. (The report includes the following: an annotated bibliography describing 10 resources, two ERIC Digests on assessment, and a list of assessment tools used by respondents. Contains 10 references.) (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 377 330

STUDENT ASSESSMENT IN MICHIGAN'S ADULT VOLUNTEER LITERACY PROGRAMS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Audette

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Michigan Literacy, Inc.
1994

CE067752

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STUDENT ASSESSMENT IN MICHIGAN'S ADULT VOLUNTEER LITERACY PROGRAMS

MICHIGAN LITERACY, INC.

Donna M. Audette
Executive Director

Joyce E. Sutton
Resources Coordinator

November, 1994

These materials were developed under a grant awarded by the Michigan Jobs Commission

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
Acknowledgements	ii
Summary of the Project	1
Review of the Literature	3
Data Summary and Recommendations	7
Bibliography	13
The 10 Most Frequently Cited Instruments and the Programs Using Them	16

Appendix

"Adult Literacy Learner Assessment" ERIC Digest No. 103	A1
"Questions to Ask When Evaluating Tests" ERIC/AE Digest	A3
All Assessment Tools Cited By Respondents	A5

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, thanks are due to the 82 volunteer literacy programs from all over Michigan who took the time to respond to the survey questionnaire.

Special thanks are also offered to:

Marina Crompton, who provided clerical support services for the duration of the project.

Donna DeButts, Director of Washtenaw Literacy, for the cover design.

Bonnie Arnett, Learning Specialist, Adrian College, who assisted with the literature search.

The **Advisory Committee** members were selected because of their professional interest and expertise in the area of assessment, and to represent literacy programs large and small, urban and rural. They generously offered their wisdom and counsel for this project, especially in the review of the assessment processes reported to be currently in use in Michigan.

Nancy Geddes
Student Assessment Coordinator
Oakland Literacy Council
Pontiac, Michigan

Carole Prisk, B.S., Secondary Education
Northern Michigan University
Regional Literacy Facilitator
Michigan Lifelong Learning Link

Virginia Schantz, B.A., MALS
Program Director
Montcalm Adult Reading Council
Greenville, Michigan

Chris Scharrer
Learning Services Coordinator
Zeeland Community Education
Zeeland, Michigan

James E. Snoddy, Ph.D.
Professor of Higher, Adult and
Lifelong Education
Michigan State University

SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT

The *Adult Volunteer Literacy Student Assessment Study* was funded by grant funds from Section 107c of the State School Aid Act, and administered by the Office of Workplace Development of the Michigan Jobs Commission. The goals of the project as proposed by Michigan Literacy, Inc. were first to collect, review, summarize and compile a reference document of all student assessment tools currently being used by adult volunteer literacy programs in Michigan. Secondly, a review of the literature was conducted to identify current research and development on adult student assessment tools specifically designed for use in volunteer literacy programs. The provision of the resource list and the summary of the literature are intended to assist programs in identifying student assessment methods best suited to their students' and their program objectives.

To collect the information on instruments currently being used in Michigan, a survey questionnaire was sent to 134 volunteer literacy programs. The questionnaire also asked for the name and phone number of a contact person from each agency. Concurrently, an extensive search of the literature was conducted which actually turned up very little in the way of specific instrumentation for adult literacy assessment used in volunteer literacy programs. Not surprising, much of what has been developed and used for adult basic education has been borrowed by the volunteer literacy field with reasonable success.

In addition to the above, the project also convened an advisory committee of professionals to identify what they perceived to be the strengths and challenges associated with the most frequently used assessment instruments as reported by the literacy community. The committee reviewed the preliminary data and summarized their thoughts and recommendations for inclusion in the section of this report entitled, "Data Summary and Recommendations". The advisory committee members were chosen because of their expertise in the literacy field, and for the diversity of location and types of programs with which they work.

It was not the intent of the project to evaluate on in any other way judge the effectiveness of adult volunteer literacy programs. The intent

was rather to compile this information and distribute it to literacy providers so that they can perhaps address for themselves the adequacy of their program's student assessment practices. The summary of the literature and the bibliography will enhance the practitioner's ability to critically choose what might work best for their program. It is further intended that the ready availability of this reference document will provide the needed incentive for those who have not yet begun a formal assessment program, to contact one of their colleagues and discuss how to get student learner assessment started in their program.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Assessment is to educational and institutional goals as maps are to travelers and their destination. (Rickard, Stiles, et.al., 1991)

Assessment and education do seem to go hand-in-hand even in the adult volunteer literacy field. We use the same word, assessment, to refer to several distinct activities, and most would agree it includes much more than testing (BCEL,1990). Rickard and Stiles (1991) describe learner assessment activities as including the means to place students into program levels, to prescribe specific learning plans, to monitor student progress and to certify competency. Often programs rely on "off the shelf" general literacy tests, many of which have been normed on the average performance of children at various grade levels (BCEL,1990).

There is very little in the current literature that discusses recently developed and validated instruments that are appropriate for the adult engaged in a tutoring relationship to improve their literacy skills. The literature supports that the Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE), the Adult Basic Learning Exam (ABLE) and the California Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS) are the most frequently used tests for student assessment in adult literacy programs nation-wide, and all three of these instruments are adult in content. Most current thinkers on the subject of literacy assessment are proposing a shift away from standardized assessment and more toward competency-based or participatory assessment methods in which the adult learner's goals become the focus of the assessment strategies.

Though the adult education field is coming to recognize the limitations of existing standardized tests and that there are very few meant specifically for adults, it also appears that there is a hesitancy to use those designed with the adult student in mind (Metz,1990) and the hesitation is probably wise. Sticht (1990) recommends avoiding testing when an adult first shows up for a program. If too much time is spent on testing at the outset, adults may just drop out (Frager,1991) or perform

poorly just because they don't have test-taking skills. The process leads to low performance and high anxiety on the part of the student (Oakley, 1988). Standardized tests are intimidating, may remind students of former failure and give a one-sided view of a multi-sided problem. They often do not measure anything pertaining to the goals of the student (Metz, 1990).

Lytle and Wolfe (1989) maintain that contrary to popular opinion, adult new readers often don't fit the image of dependent, weak failures. Instead, they operate "...within a complex social network in which they are interdependent, offering skills of their own in exchange for the literacy skills of others." Just as no single teaching strategy is effective for all students, there is no single assessment instrument or process that will provide quality information for all adult learners (Rickard and Stiles, 1991).

Lytle and Wolfe (1989) describe four approaches to learner assessment. The first is the standardized approach which has been discussed above. This usually includes grade-equivalent scores, is cost effective, is usually independent of the curriculum, and measures literacy as reading skills. Materials-based assessment is commercially available and is related to progress in pre-determined materials, such as the assessments that are part of the **Challenger Series** by Laubach. Competency-based assessment is specified to real life tasks, has a continuum of difficulty, is administered frequently with feedback being provided, and includes a broad range of strategies. Lastly, there is participatory assessment. This includes literacy as practices and critical reflection, takes into account a range of texts, tasks and contexts, involves the learner as an active partner in the assessment, is ongoing and also provides a broad range of strategies.

Richard Venezky (1992) suggests that there should be two paths that adults involved in literacy or basic education could choose from: that which leads to a GED or other formal education and that which gives the student practical skills they need for "self esteem, work, home and civic needs". If we agree that the standardized test is more closely associated with formal educational settings then it is expected that more standardized tests will be used for adults in ABE and GED classes. Within the structure of the ABE classroom, just like in the less formal

tutor/student partnership, the adult learner brings a variety of goals and along with them, the need for a variety of assessment strategies to address them.

Almost all of the literature of the 1990's on the subject of adult learner assessment, including literacy education, supports diversity in initial assessment as well as in on-going evaluation of student progress. It is not enough to just measure success with tangible literacy skills but we must also take into account the very real but difficult to measure outcomes such as self-esteem and the accomplishment of lifelong learning goals. In a paper to the Adult Literacy Assessment Workshop in Philadelphia in 1991, Rickard suggests that "good" assessment strategies must articulate with multiple indicators used to mark progress toward the goals of the learner, the goals of the program and the goals of the policy makers.

Current publications identify the other purposes for assessment that go beyond the student placement and progress issues. Balancing the students' needs for success while demonstrating to stake holders that programs have successfully used their resources to achieve their goals is a complex task (Lytle and Wolfe,1989). Program centered assessment evaluates how well a program meets the needs of its adult learners and also assesses staff training along with the availability and allocation of pertinant resources (Rickard,1991). It would be a mistake to use measures of student progress as the only data for evaluating program successes (BCEL,1990). Administrators often want assessments that can be used before and after tutoring and which have the added feature of validity and reliability often found in the standardized instruments (Frager,1991). Though this is a part of the program evaluation, student progress alone may be due to any number of factors, some of which may be outside the influence of the program on the student.

The continuing theme that most of the authors cited here speak to is the need for a multitude of approaches to meet the variety of student goals, the variety of activities we label as assessment, and the variety of audiences interested in the results of the assessments (students, tutors, administrators, funders, bosses, etc.). Though a fair amount of space has been devoted to the limitations of standardized tests, both those normed on grade-level (children) reading and those developed specifically for

adults, it is not the intent of this summary to lead the reader to conclude that all standardized tests should be banned from use. Instead, the consensus of the literature reviewed seems to be to not necessarily eliminate but to look beyond the standardized instruments; to build a montage of assessment strategies for adults involved in literacy programs that will take into account their unique and multifaceted needs for measures of success, however they may define that success.

In conclusion, the following excerpt from the January, 1990 issue of the Newsletter For The Business Community, summarizes well the most current and prevalent thinking on what assessment should be in the adult literacy field:

A growing number of practitioners around the country agree and have begun to explore alternative approaches to assessment. The perspective that guides these efforts is that the paramount purpose of assessment should be to help the learner achieve his or her goals; that what is assessed must reflect what the learner wishes or needs to accomplish; that the process must build on the learner's experience and strengths rather than deficits; that assessment is not something done to the learner; that it should not be externally imposed nor shrouded in mystery, nor separated from what goes on in the regular course of learning activity. Rather, it is postulated, assessment should be an organic part of the learning experience - an ongoing collaboration between the teacher, the learner, and the text, to review and refocus what should take place in the light of progress being made. It should not depend on a single procedure but a variety of procedures. And one of its major functions should be to produce feedback that will make programs more effective. Most of all, testing instruments should convey respect for learners.

DATA SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Student assessment in literacy programs is conducted for many different reasons using many different methods. At intake, assessment is intended to result in information that will help programs choose materials that are suitable for the student, and to provide information to the tutor regarding the student's learning abilities, style and current reading level.

Eighty-two of the 134 volunteer literacy programs in Michigan responded to the survey on student assessment and 76 of these reported conducting student assessments on a regular basis. Nearly all of the responding programs (92%) reported that they use assessment information to "determine suitable materials" or "for student placement".

Once tutoring gets underway, student assessment is valuable as a means of measuring progress with reading as well as progress toward other life goals important for the student to achieve as a result of being involved in a tutoring relationship. Some programs do assessment when the student leaves the program to be able to document change from intake to termination. Of the programs responding, 87% reported doing student assessment before tutoring begins, 76% do assessment during the tutoring process and 32% complete assessments when students leave the program.

The following list, in order from most frequently reported (by 38 programs) to least frequently reported (by 1 program), cites the various ways programs use the assessment information they collect:

- ☐ to determine suitable materials for the student
- ☐ to appropriately place the student
- ☐ to assess student progress
- ☐ to make recommendation's to tutors
- ☐ to choose an appropriate tutor for the student
- ☐ to determine student goals
- ☐ to provide information to funders and the Michigan Department of Education
- ☐ to identify student study skills
- ☐ to make progress information available to students and tutors
- ☐ to provide baseline data
- ☐ to identify student areas of difficulty

- ☐ for program planning
- ☐ to determine program effectiveness

The materials used to conduct these assessments vary as widely as the types of programs there are across the state. It is the consensus of this project that diversity in assessment practices is positive and should be encouraged so that programs continue to find means for collecting information about their students' initial levels of functioning and progress as they proceed with a tutoring program. It is unlikely that any single instrument or method will meet every program's need.

Besides the important information that programs and tutors and students can learn about their efforts when assessment is done as a regular part of the program, there are also advantages to having aggregate assessment information available for audiences external to the program. Often funders and the Department of Education will require information about the progress made by participants in a program. Being able to report student goal achievement and/or reading improvement as documented by the program's assessment data, provides the concrete information that potential funders, volunteers and even potential students want to know before they commit their involvement to a program. No organization or individual for that matter, wants to assign their resources or energy to a program that has no track record of success. An ongoing assessment system will feed information into a volunteer literacy program's outreach and fund raising efforts that is far more compelling than trying to convince potential supporters of the worthiness of the program's efforts without documented proof of student progress.

The volunteer literacy programs in Michigan which responded to the survey collectively use 40 different assessment instruments. Additionally, 24 programs reported having designed their own assessment tools and 38 programs employ open-ended interviews with their students as part of their assessment strategies. Almost all programs use a combination of tools and methods to conduct student assessment, and as reported previously, conduct assessments at various times throughout the student's enrollment in the program.

In considering the various tests most often reported to be used by Michigan programs, the Advisory Committee used their professional judgement to identify the following strengths and limitations:

INSTRUMENT	STRENGTHS	LIMITATIONS
Slosson Oral Reading Test (Sort)	• Quick • Provides a good starting point • Easy to administer • Inexpensive • Can be administered by volunteers	• Lay-out can be intimidating • Words are out-dated
Where-To-Start (from LITSTART)	• Quick • Not intimidating • Good as an ice-breaker • Can be administered by volunteers • Diagnostic for word recognition and sounds, word attack skills, reading level indicator (0-4), and spelling skills	• Works for initial assessment only
Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE)	• Shows grade level and skill mastery • Fairly reliable and validated • Recent development	• Not generally for volunteers to administer • Intimidating • Not for low-level readers • Cumbersome • Timed
Botel Reading Inventory Word Opposites Sub Test	• Quick • Can be administered by volunteers • Easy to score	• Concept of opposites is hard • Evidence of cultural bias

Portfolio assessment was mentioned specifically by one program. Though portfolios are commonplace in high schools and the junior high grades in Michigan, they are just beginning to be used in the adult

education arena. *Portfolios are usually files or folders that contain collections of a student's work. They furnish a broad portrait of individual performance, assembled over time. As students put together their portfolios, they must evaluate their own work, a key feature of performance assessment. Portfolios are most common in the subject areas of English and language arts, where drafts, revisions, works in progress, and final papers are typically included to show students' development. Vermont and Michigan are among the states taking the lead on portfolio use for assessment (Rudner,1991).*

The Advisory Committee strongly recommends that volunteer literacy programs consider the portfolio assessment for implementation with their adult students. It appears to be the best method for ongoing assessment of student progress. Any standardized tests used at intake can become a part of the student's portfolio but the process additionally affords the opportunity to measure growth in many life areas in addition to reading level. Another advantage is that the portfolio assessment process is student-centered and therefore allows for student goals to become the yardstick along which a program, a tutor and a student can measure success. While not a lot of literacy programs have used portfolio assessment there are resources available through the State Literacy Resource Center and a few experienced practitioners within the state.

In summary, it is a credit to the field of adult volunteer literacy in Michigan that so many programs (at least 58%) are involved in some method of ongoing student assessment. There are a variety of methods being employed and programs are encouraged to design an assessment process that best meets the needs of the students, tutors and program staff. A student-centered, multi-dimensional assessment such as portfolios is recommended for consideration to be used with adult students. There are a variety of reasons to do ongoing assessment, including to establish a baseline at intake, to be able to design an appropriate program based on a student's needs and abilities, to measure progress throughout the tutoring process, and to make available concrete information about a program's successes for volunteer and student recruitment, and for fund-seeking ventures. Any programs beginning a student assessment process, or considering changing or expanding their current assessment practices, are encouraged to use this resource

directory to identify and then contact their colleagues around the state to explore and exchange ideas about student assessment practices.

REFERENCES

Frager, Alan M. "Adult literacy assessment: Existing tools and promising developments". Journal of Reading, 35:3, November, 1991, pp 256-259.

Lytle, Susan L. and Marcie Wolfe. "Adult Literacy Education: Program Evaluation and Learner Assessment". Information Series No. 338. ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education, Columbus, OH, 1989.

Metz, Elizabeth. "Issues in adult literacy assessment". Journal of Reading March, 1990, pp 468-469.

Oakley, Nancy. "Who's Learning How to Read and How Do We Know?". National Adult Literacy Symposium, National Press Club, Washington, D.C., September, 1988.

Rickard, Patricia L. "Assessment in Adult Literacy Programs". Adult Literacy Assessment Workshop, Philadelphia, PA, April, 1991.

Rickard, Patricia L., Richard L. Stiles, et. al. "The Essential Role of Assessment". Adult Learning, Vol. 2, No. 7. Washington, D.C., 1991.

Rudner, Lawrence M. "Assessing Civics Education". ERIC Digest Series, 1991.

"Standardized Tests: Their Use & Misuse". Business Council for Effective Literacy, No. 22, January, 1990

Sticht, Thomas G. "Testing and Assessment in Adult Basic Education and English as a Second Language Programs". Applied Behavioral & Cognitive Sciences, Inc., San Diego, CA, January, 1990.

Venezky, Richard L. "Marching Literacy Testing with Social Policy: What are the Alternatives?" National Center on Adult Literacy, Policy Brief No. PB92-1, Philadelphia, PA, 1992.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
OF
RECOMMENDED READING

Davis, Ann E. & Judith A. Arter. Annotated Bibliography on ABE/ESL Assessment. The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory PROGRAM REPORT. PORTLAND, OR, JULY, 1992.

This is an extensive (over 120pp) annotated bibliography including a review of the literature, and a section on assessment in general. Three distinct additional sections include: Portfolio Annotated Bibliography, Reading Annotated Bibliography, and Mathematics Annotated Bibliography. Not all are specific to volunteer literacy, but many selections could be helpful.

Hill, Jacqui & Janet Vern. "Persuading Volunteer Tutors and Adult Literacy Learners to Use Portfolio Assessment". Literacy Connections. State Literacy Resource Center. Mount Pleasant, MI, Fall 1994.

A report of a research project undertaken to investigate what modifications would need to be made to portfolio assessment to make it inviting and useful for volunteer tutors and adult learners. The project also investigated training strategies to convince tutors to use this fairly new technique, and whether this more authentic assessment methodology will increase learner-driven instruction.

Jackson, Gregg B. Measures for Adult Literacy Programs. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Tests, Measurement and Evaluation. American Institutes for Research. Washington, D.C., August, 1990.

Reviews of 63 test instruments designed to measure student outcomes. The reviews are written for teachers, administrators, evaluators and researchers in a user-friendly format. Most of the 10 most frequently used instruments in Michigan's programs are reviewed. The document is divided into four distinct sections: Basic Skills: Reading Writing, and Mathematics, Oral English Proficiency of ESL Students, Affective Outcomes, and Critical Thinking.

Kirby, Rita. "Portfolio = Performance Assessment". Literacy Connections. State Literacy Resource Center. Mt. Pleasant, MI, Summer, 1994.

A summary overview of the definition, purpose, background, and components of the student portfolio process in Michigan.

McGrail, Loren & Rick Schwartz, Eds. Adventures in Assessment. Vol. 5: The Tale of the Tools. System for Adult Basic Education Support, Bureau of Adult Education, Massachusetts Department of Education. October, 1993.

Reports from a study entitled "Greater Opportunities in Adult Learners Success (G.O. A. L. S.)" by members of the project team. Specifically addressing teachers of adults, the reports discuss a variety of alternative assessment techniques appropriate for use in adult learner settings. Includes samples of student evaluation forms, student writings and initial interview instruments, and a book review by Steve Reuys on It Belongs to Me: A Guide to Portfolio Assessment in Adult Education Programs.

Sticht, Thomas G. "Testing and Assessment in Adult Basic Education and English as a Second Language Programs". Applied Behavioral & Cognitive Science, Inc. San Diego, CA, January, 1990.

A critical look at standardized testing and how it may or may not be applicable when used in adult basic education and ESL programs. This report offers a clear definition of what constitutes standardization and addresses alternative assessment methods that can be developed to meet the objectives of the learner, the tutor, and the funder. Specifically reviews ABLE, BEST, CASAS-Reading, CASAS-Listening, ESLOA, GED Official Practice Tests,READ, and TABE-forms 5 and 6.

Webster, Jolan. "Planning The Portfolio Process In Adult Education". Literacy Connections. State Literacy Resource Center. Mt. Pleasant, MI, Summer, 1994.

A report on a project undertaken at SouthKent Community Education in 1992 to build a workable portfolio process. Provides direction for programs just starting out in portfolio development.

Bibliography and Volunteer Training Guide. Oakland Literacy Council, New Reader Assessment Project. Pontiac, MI, 1994.

Annotated bibliography of 12 commonly used assessment tools adaptable for use in adult literacy programs. Information provided for each test includes the time it takes to administer, how it's scored, the cost, and how to order copies. The authors also provide strengths and weaknesses for use in adult volunteer literacy programs.

Literacy Practitioner. Assessment Issue. Literacy Volunteers of America, New York State, Inc. Vol. 2, No.1, August, 1994.

The entire issue of the newsletter is devoted to assessment in volunteer literacy programs.. Specifically addressed are workplace literacy assessment and The California Adult Learner Progress (CALPEP).

"Performance Based Assessment". The ERIC Review. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Educational Resources Information Center. Vol. 3, Issue 1, Winter, 1994.

This issue explores how teachers, administrators, parents and students can determine what a student knows by means other than standardized tests. Provided is an in depth discussion of performance assessment along with suggestions on how to design performance-based assessments. Though not strictly written for the volunteer literacy program, the overview and case study material can be helpful for literacy programs just starting to work with performance-based assessment strategies.

ADULT BASIC LEARNING EXAM (ABLE)
2nd edition. Karlsen, B., Gardner, E (1986-87).
San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation

COUNTY	LITERACY PROGRAM	CONTACT PERSON	PHONE
Cheboygan	Cheboygan Adult & Community Education	Michele Nixon	(616) 627-5613
Gogebic	Gogebic County Community School Program	Bruce Kerkove	(906) 932-2701
Marquette	Marquette Community Schools	Mary Margaret Sloan	(906) 225-4223
Van Buren	Straits Area Community Education	Don Gustafson	(906) 643-8145

ADULT PLACEMENT INDICATOR (API)
Copeman, K., Ribarchik, K. (1986)
Hadley, MI: Hadley Press.

COUNTY	LITERACY PROGRAM	CONTACT PERSON	PHONE
Berrien	Twin Cities Area Literacy Council	Sandy Page	(616) 925-7323
Calhoun	Literacy Council of Calhoun County	Mary Jo Nye	(616) 968-6488
Genesee	Bendle/Carman Ainsworth	Violet Anderson	(810) 234-3669
	Christ Episcopal Center	Mary Jo Allard	(810) 239-9425
Lapeer	Volunteer Tutors Association	Karen Bables	(810) 664-2737
Wayne	Southgate Adult Education Downriver Literacy Council	Mary Lou Provost	(313) 246-4633

BADER READING AND LANGUAGE INVENTORY
Bader, L. (1983)
New York, NY: MacMillan Publishing

COUNTY	LITERACY PROGRAM	CONTACT PERSON	PHONE
Alpena	READ Alpena County Adult Literacy Program	Janet Fulton	(517) 356-6188
Lenawee	Project LEAD	Elizabeth Darnell	(517) 265-7205
Macomb	Macomb Reading Partners	Linda Glowicki	(810) 286-2750
Wayne	Dominican Literacy Center	Sister Marie Schoenlein	(313) 882-4853

BOTEL READING INVENTORY-WORD OPPOSITES TEST
Botel, M. (1961)
Cleveland, OH: Modern Curriculum Press

COUNTY	LITERACY PROGRAM	CONTACT PERSON	PHONE
Lapeer	Volunteer Tutors Association	Karen Bables	(810) 664-2737
Macomb	Macomb Reading Partners	Linda Glowicki	(810) 286-2750
	North Macomb Literacy	Helen Miller	(810) 752-3297
Midland	Literacy Council of Midland County	Diane Kott	(517) 839-0540
Monroe	Project READ	Lilyan Hinkley	(313) 242-5799 ext. 1325
St. Clair	Library Literacy Project of St. Clair County	Sherrlyne Snyder	(810) 987-7323
Tuscola	Tuscola Literacy Council	Ellen Toner	(800) 437-9650

LITERACY ASSESSMENT SURVEY (LAS)
Copeman, K., Ribarchik, K. (1986)
Hadley, MI: Hadley Press.

COUNTY	LITERACY PROGRAM	CONTACT PERSON	PHONE
Berrien	Twin Cities Area Literacy Council	Sandy Page	(616) 925-7323
Calhoun	Literacy Council of Calhoun County	Mary Jo Nye	(616) 968-6488
Genesee	Christ Episcopal Center	Mary Jo Allard	(810) 239-9425
	Volunteers for Adult Literacy	Mollie Hembruch	(810) 760-5281
Montcalm	Carson City Crystal Community Education	Marilee Mills	(517) 584-3898
Wayne	Southgate Adult Education Downriver Literacy Council	Mary Lou Provost	(313) 246-4633

COUNTY	LITERACY PROGRAM	CONTACT PERSON	PHONE
Alger	Alger Area Literacy Council	Herbert Ingraham	(906) 387-4969
Cass	Cass County Literacy Council	Anna M. Brosnan	(800) 882-5208
Delta	Bay de Noc Literacy Council	Elizabeth Froberg	(906) 789-0227
Grand Traverse	Grand Traverse Area Literacy Council	Carol McConnell	(616) 941-7727
Houghton	Elaine Bacon Literacy Program	Ruth Shetron	(906) 337-4635
Marquette	Marquette Community Schools	Mary Sloan	(906) 225-4223
Otsego	Retired Senior Volunteer Program	Tami Phillips	(517) 732-6232
St. Clair	Library Literacy Project of St. Clair County	Sherrlyne Snyder	(810) 987-7323
Van Buren	South Haven Area Literacy Council	Louise Wepfer	(616) 637-1424
Wayne	Dominican Literacy Center	Sister Marie Schoenlein	(313) 882-0436

READING EVALUATION ADULT DIAGNOSIS (READ)
Coloin, R., Root, J. (1972-82)
Syracuse, NY: Literacy Volunteers of America, Inc.

COUNTY	LITERACY PROGRAM	CONTACT PERSON	PHONE
Isabella	Mt. Pleasant Area Volunteers for Literacy	Linda Hyde	(517) 774-3105
Mecosta	Retired Senior Volunteer Program	Tami Phillips	(517) 732-6232
Wayne	Literacy Volunteers of America-Detroit	Anna Merritt	(313) 872-7720

SLOSSON ORAL READING TEST (SORT)
Slosson, R. (1963). East Aurora, NY:
Slosson Educational Publishers

COUNTY	LITERACY PROGRAM	CONTACT PERSON	PHONE
Alpena	READ Alpena County Library Adult Literacy Program	Janet M. Fulton	(517) 356-6188
Branch	Branch County Literacy Council	Colleen Knight	(517) 279-9833
Cheboygan	Cheboygan County Libraries for Literacy	Fred Bickley	(616) 625-9370
Clare	Clare-Gladwin Literacy Council, Inc.	Dixie Wickiser	(517) 435-2800
Delta	Bay de Noc Literacy Council	Elizabeth Froberg	(906) 789-0207
Grand Traverse	Grand Traverse Area Literacy Council	Carol McConnell	(616) 941-7727
Huron	Huron Efforts for Literacy Progress	Gail Apley	(517) 269-9502
Ionia	Belding Area Literacy Council	Mary Ann Hagemeyer	(616) 794-1750
	Ionia County Literacy Council	Robin Mamo	(616) 527-2345
	Portland Area Literacy Services	Elizabeth Jackson	(517) 647-2987
Kent	Kent County Literacy Council	Judy Zainea	(616) 459-5151
Lapeer	Volunteer Tutors Association	Karen Bables	(810) 664-2737
Lenawee	Project LEAD	Elizabeth Darnell	(517) 265-7205
Livingston	Livingston County Literacy Council	Kathryn Fuller	(517) 548-6324
Macomb	Macomb Reading Partners	Linda Glowicki	(810) 286-2750
Midland	Literacy Council of Midland County	Diane Kott	(517) 839-0540
Monroe	Project Read	Lilyan Hinkley	(313) 242-5799 ext. 1325
Montcalm	Carson City Crystal Community Education	Marilee Mills	(517) 584-3898
	Montcalm Adult Reading Council (ESL)	Olivette Kassouni	(616) 754-4635

continued

COUNTY	LITERACY PROGRAM	CONTACT PERSON	PHONE
Otsego	Retired Senior Volunteer Program	Tami Phillips	(517) 732-6232
Sanilac	Literacy Volunteer of America-Sanilac Literacy Council	Grace Temple	(810) 648-2200
Shiawasee	Shiawasee Adult Literacy Association	Maxine Capitan	(517) 725-7166
St. Clair	Library Literacy Project of St. Clair County	Sherrlene Snyder	(816) 987-7323
Tuscola	Tuscola Literacy Council	Ellen Toner	(800) 437-9650
Washtenaw	Washtenaw Literacy	Donna DeButts	(313) 482-0565
Wexford	Cadillac Area Literacy Council	Betty Ann Yokeum	(616) 775-5040

TESTS OF ADULT BASIC EDUCATION (TABE)
CTB Mc Graw Hill (1957-87)
Monterey, CA: CTB Mc Graw Hill

COUNTY	LITERACY PROGRAM	CONTACT PERSON	PHONE
Antrim	Antrim-Kalkaska Literacy Council	Toni Wayda	(616) 258-9304
Baraga	L'Anse-Baraga Community Schools	Patricia Baribeau	(906) 353-6663
Cadillac	Cadillac Area Literacy Council	Betty Ann Yokeum	(616) 775-5040
Crawford	Camp Lehman Literacy Connection	Patricia Lawrence	(517) 348-8101
Dickinson	Even Start	Angie DeBois	(906) 779-2695
Emmet	Petoskey Adult Community Education	Kristi Muller	(616) 348-0087
Genesee	Business Industry Resource Institute	Jim Chybowski	(810) 762-0386
	Kearsley Adult Literacy	Steve Paradis	(810) 736-1355
Gogebic	Gogebic County Community School Program	Bruce Kerkove	(906) 932-2701
Marquette	Marquette Community Schools	Mary Sloan	(906) 225-4223
Mason	Mason-Lake Adult and Community Education	Elizabeth Stark	(616) 757-5700
Newaygo	Fremont Adult and Community Education	Carolyn Hardy	(616) 924-2300
	Newaygo Community Education Consortium	Rita Bouman Shea	(616) 652-1649
Ottawa	Zeeland Community Education	Chris Scharrer	(616) 772-6236
Saginaw	Saginaw Area Literacy/Adult Basic Education Program	Louise Kring	(517) 759-3606
Van Buren	Straits Area Community Education	Don Gustafson	(906) 643-8145
Wayne	Detroit Adult Education	Frances Sivak	(313) 245-3768
	Michigan Catholic Health Systems' Infant Mortality Project	Beverly Ciokajlo	(313) 868-8420
	Schoolcraft College	Sirkka Gudan	(313) 462-4436

COUNTY	LITERACY PROGRAM	CONTACT PERSON	PHONE
Allegan	Allegan County Reading Program	Donna Roop	(616) 673-8661
	Ransom District Library	Rose Frost	(616) 685-8024
Bay	Literacy Council of Bay City	Ann Cotten	(517) 686-8700
Berrien	Twin Cities Area Literacy Council	Sandy Page	(616) 925-7323
Cass	Cass County Literacy Council	Anna M. Brosman & Marion Robinson	(800) 882-5208
Cheboygan	Cheboygan County Libraries for Literacy	Fred Bickley	(616) 625-9370
Genesee	Bendle/Carman Ainsworth	Violet Anderson	(810) 234-3669
	Dukette Learning Center	Sister Catherine Broughton	(810) 785-4743
	Helping Others Through Tutoring	Carol Diem	(810) 629-1892
Ionia	Belding Area Literacy Council	Mary Ann Hagemeyer	(616) 794-1750
	Portland Area Literacy Services	Elizabeth Jackson	(517) 647-2987
Macomb	Macomb Reading Partners	Linda Glowicki	(810) 286-2750
Marquette	Marquette Community Schools	Mary Sloan	(906) 225-4223
Mason	Friends of Ludington Public Literacy Program	Barbara Sutter	(616) 843-8465
Montcalm	Montcalm Adult Reading Council	Virginia Schantz	(616) 754-1391
	Montcalm Adult Reading Council (ESL)	Olivette Kassouni	(616) 754-4635
Muskegon	Project Literacy	Cindy Komray	(616) 722-6474
Ogemaw	Ogemaw County Literacy Council	Donna Gushen	(517) 345-3033
Otsego	Retired Senior Volunteer Program	Tami Phillips	(517) 732-6232

continued

COUNTY	LITERACY PROGRAM	CONTACT PERSON	PHONE
Presque Isle	Presque Isle District Library Literacy Program	Valerie Tucker	(517) 733-6621
Roscommon	Roscommon County Literacy Council	Jan Montei	(517) 275-4506
St. Joseph	St. Joseph County Literacy Council, Three Rivers	Alice Teeters	(616) 279-7949
Wexford	Cadillac Area Literacy Council	Betty Ann Yokeum	(616) 775-5040

RESOURCES

Nancy Geddes, Student Assessment Coordinator Oakland Literacy Council	(810) 338-8840
Jaqueline Hill, Director of the Educational Support Program Grand Valley State University	(616) 895-3401
Rita Kirby, Director of the Lifelong Learning and School to Work Transition State Literacy Resources Center	(517) 774-7690
Janet Vern, Director of Project LEAD Adrian, Michigan	(517) 265-7205

APPENDIX

ERIC DIGEST No. 103

EDO-CE-90-103

Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education

ADULT LITERACY LEARNER ASSESSMENT

Learner assessment, the process of collecting and analyzing data provided by learners in order to make judgments about the literacy accomplishments of individuals or groups, is a key feature of adult literacy programs. Learner assessment occurs in different forms throughout an adult's participation in a literacy program. It frequently reflects different views of literacy and learning and yields distinct types of information to different stakeholders. It provides information to teachers for use in instructional planning, to learners for determining their progress toward particular goals, to program managers and staff for evaluating the impact of instruction, and to funders for establishing some degree of program accountability and success (Lytle and Wolfe 1989).

Four major types of approaches to learner assessment have been identified in the literature: standardized testing, materials based, competency based, and participatory. This ERIC Digest provides an overview of these four assessment approaches, including some issues affiliated with each. It ends with some suggested guidelines for selecting assessment procedures.

Approaches to Learner Assessment

Each of the four approaches to learner assessment described here reflects varying philosophical orientations and perspectives related to learners, literacy, and educational contexts.

Standardized Testing

Because standardized tests are relatively easy and inexpensive to administer, standardized testing is the most widely used approach in adult literacy assessment in the United States. Large groups of adults can take a test under the supervision of a comparatively small number of administrators. In addition, the training requirements to administer the test are minimal (ibid.).

By definition, a standardized test is designed to be given under specified, standard conditions. If it is not, the results are invalid (Business Council for Effective Literacy 1990; Sticht 1990). Standardized tests may be either norm- or criterion-referenced. Many of the standardized tests of reading used in adult literacy programs are norm-referenced, that is, they measure an individual's performance against a "normal" performance established by others who have taken the test (BCEL 1990; Lytle and Wolfe 1989). Criterion-referenced tests, on the other hand, assess a learner's achievement against an absolute standard or criterion of performance rather than against a norming group (Sticht 1990).

Despite their extensive use in adult literacy assessment, standardized tests have a number of critics among researchers and practitioners. According to the BCEL (1990), the "objections [to standardized tests] tend to fall into two broad categories: their intrinsic defects and their misuse" (p. 6). The major intrinsic defect is the fact that they rely on grade-level equivalents, i.e., they have been normed on children. Such measures do not reveal the extent of the life experiences and knowledge that adults bring to an instructional program nor do they provide data that can be used in developing an appropriate instructional program. Other difficulties in the use of standardized tests involve the relationship of the tests to a program's instructional model and the fact that many adults associate them with previous school failure (BCEL 1990; Lytle and Wolfe 1989).

The misuse of standardized tests relates to the practice of employing them as the sole component of program evaluation. Although learner assessment is an important component of program evaluation, a number of other elements such as program management, teaching, and curriculum need to be examined in judging program effectiveness (BCEL 1990).

Improvements that address some of their intrinsic defects are being made in standardized tests. The Degrees of Reading Power test uses cloze passages and therefore reflects more current views of the reading process as the construction of reading. Item response theory, a psychometric theory that takes into account certain factors such as item difficulty, is also being applied in some standardized tests (Lytle and Wolfe 1989).

Materials-based Assessment

Materials-based assessment refers to the practice of evaluating learners on the basis of tests following the completion of a particular set of curriculum materials. It shares some features with standardized tests such as availability through commercial publishers, ease of administration, and a view of literacy as reading skills.

Although the materials-based approach to assessment makes possible a close connection between curriculum and assessment, it creates a closed system that does not invite analysis of teaching processes and materials. Because most of the curriculum is prepackaged, there is little opportunity for learners to direct their own study. Also, the literacy activities beyond the system go unassessed and may not be recognized as meaningful by learners and teachers (Lytle and Wolfe 1989).

Competency-based Assessment

Closely related to criterion-referenced standardized testing, competency-based adult literacy assessment measures an individual's performance against a predetermined standard of acceptable performance. Progress is based on actual performance rather than on how well learners perform in comparison to others (Lytle and Wolfe 1989; Sticht 1990).

Competency-based education and assessment were developed in response to the need to assess adult literacy achievement within a functional framework. Because it recognizes the importance of prior learning and rewards what individuals can already do, it is more compatible for use with adults than standardized testing or the materials-based approach. Assessment is also frequent, providing learners with regular feedback and allowing them to advance when ready (Lytle and Wolfe 1989).

Despite its compatibility with adult education philosophy and practice, competency-based assessment also has its critics. Because competency-based assessment usually takes place within the educational setting, it is still a test given under classroom conditions; thus a key theoretical concept of successful functioning in life roles is removed from the assessment process. Some critics also contend that, like the materials-based approach, competency-based assessment systems control and restrict teaching and learning (ibid.).

Participatory Assessment

Participatory assessment is a process that views assessment as much more than testing. Features of participatory assessment include a view of literacy as practices and critical reflection, the use of a broad range of strategies in assessment, and an active role for learners in the assessment process (BCEL 1990; Lytle and Wolfe 1989). Those advocating a participatory approach do so because of a belief that "learners, their characteristics, aspirations, backgrounds, and needs should be at the center of literacy instruction" (Fingeret and Jurmo 1989, p. 5).

The following assumptions support the participatory assessment process: "the paramount purpose of assessment should be to help the learner achieve his or her goals; what is assessed must reflect what the learner wishes or needs to accomplish; the process must build on the learner's experience and strengths rather than deficits; assessment is not something done to the learner; [and] it should not be externally imposed nor shrouded in mystery, nor separated from what goes on in the regular course of learning activity" (BCEL 1990, p. 7).

Sometimes known as "alternative assessment approaches or methods" (BCEL 1990; Sticht 1990), elements of participatory assessment have been adopted by a number of adult literacy educators. The Adult Literacy Evaluation Project (ALEP) in Philadelphia is a project that includes many features of participatory assessment. This collaborative research project has developed alternatives to standardized tests and grade-level equivalences in measuring progress in literacy. The California Adult Learner Progress Evaluation Process, a joint program of the California State Libraries/California Literacy Campaign and the Educational Testing Service, also employs some participatory approaches to assessment. It uses forms developed for joint use by tutors and learners but that are written with the learner as the primary audience (Lytle and Wolfe 1989).

Despite its congruency with many of the assumptions underlying good adult education practice, participatory assessment is not without its critics. One question has to do with whether the use of alternate forms of assessment--rather than standardized tests--leads to less demanding levels of achievement. Also, sole reliance on nonstandardized methods makes it difficult to make comparisons with other programs for the purpose of program evaluation (Sticht 1990).

Conclusion

Given the plethora of approaches and instruments available for assessing adult literacy learners, what should guide the decisions about which to use? Nurss (1989) suggests the following questions be considered in selecting assessment instruments and procedures for use in adult literacy: What is the purpose of the assessment?, Is the assessment instrument appropriate for use with adults?, How reliable, practical, and valid is the instrument?, Is the instrument culturally sensitive?, and Is there congruence between the instrument/approach and the instruction.

According to Lytle and Wolfe (1989) "of prime importance seems to be the degree of congruence between particular approaches and a program's curricula and teaching practices" (p. 57). However, some interpret "the degree of congruence" to mean that both instruction and assessment should be standardized. Also, some question whether any single measure is capable of capturing the repertoire of skills and strategies an individual needs to accomplish a variety of literacy tasks.

Because of the variety of learner goals and accomplishments, multiple methods of assessment seem logical. Such an approach provides learners, teachers, and other stakeholders with multiple views of learner accomplishments.

References

This ERIC Digest is based on the following publication:

Lytle, S. L., and Wolfe, M. *Adult Literacy Education: Program Evaluation and Learner Assessment.* Information Series no. 338. Columbus: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education, Center on Education and Training for Employment, The Ohio State University, 1989. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 315 665).

Additional References

Business Council for Effective Literacy. "Standardized Tests: Their Use and Misuse." *BCEL Newsletter for the Business Community* no. 22, (January 1990): 1, 6-9. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 314 636).

Fingeret, A., and Jurmo, P., eds. *Participatory Literacy Education. New Directions for Continuing Education* no. 42. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1989.

Nurss, J. R. *Assessment Models & Instruments: Adult Populations.* Atlanta: Center for the Study of Adult Literacy, Georgia State University, November 1989. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 313 572).

Sticht, T. G. *Testing and Assessment in Adult Basic Education and English as a Second Language Programs.* San Diego: Applied Behavioral and Cognitive Sciences, Inc., January 1990. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 317 867).

This ERIC Digest was developed in 1990 by Susan Imel with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education under Contract No. RI88062005. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of OERI or the Department of Education. Digests are in the public domain and may be freely reproduced.

CENTER ON EDUCATION
AND TRAINING FOR EMPLOYMENT
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
1900 KENNY ROAD • COLUMBUS, OHIO 43210
Telephone: (614) 292-4353 or (800) 848-4815

CUA

ERIC/AE DIGEST

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

EDO-TM-94-06 April 1994

Questions To Ask When Evaluating Tests

Lawrence M. Rudner, ERIC/AE

The *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* established by the American Educational Research Association, the American Psychological Association, and the National Council on Measurement in Education, are intended to provide a comprehensive basis for evaluating tests. This Digest identifies the key standards applicable to most test evaluation situations. Sample questions are presented to help in your evaluations.

Test Coverage and Use

There must be a clear statement of recommended uses and a description of the population for which the test is intended.

The principal question to ask when evaluating a test is whether it is appropriate for your intended purposes as well as your students. The use intended by the test developer must be justified by the publisher on technical grounds. You then need to evaluate your intended use against the publisher's intended use. Questions to ask:

1. *What are the intended uses of the test? What interpretations does the publisher feel are appropriate? Are inappropriate applications identified?*
2. *Who is the test designed for? What is the basis for considering whether the test applies to your students?*

Appropriate Samples for Test Validation and Norming

The samples used for test validation and norming must be of adequate size and must be sufficiently representative to substantiate validity statements, to establish appropriate norms, and to support conclusions regarding the use of the instrument for the intended purpose.

The individuals in the norming and validation samples should represent the group for which the test is intended in terms of age, experience and background. Questions to ask:

1. *How were the samples used in pilot testing, validation and norming chosen? How is this sample related to your student population? Were participation rates appropriate?*
2. *Was the sample size large enough to develop stable estimates with minimal fluctuation due to sampling errors? Where statements are made concerning subgroups, are there enough test-takers in each subgroup?*
3. *Do the difficulty levels of the test and criterion measures (if any) provide an adequate basis for validating and norming the instrument? Are there sufficient variations in test scores?*

Reliability

The test is sufficiently reliable to permit stable estimates of individual ability.

Fundamental to the evaluation of any instrument is the degree to which test scores are free from measurement error and are consistent from one occasion to another. Sources of measurement error, which include fatigue, nervousness, content sampling, answering mistakes, misinterpreting instructions and guessing, contribute to an individual's score and lower a test's reliability.

Different types of reliability estimates should be used to estimate the contributions of different sources of measurement error. Inter-rater reliability coefficients provide estimates of errors due to inconsistencies in judgment between raters. Alternate-form reliability coefficients provide estimates of the extent to which individuals can be expected to rank the same on alternate forms of a test. Of primary interest are estimates of internal consistency which account for error due to content sampling, usually the largest single component of measurement error. Questions to ask:

1. *How have reliability estimates been computed? Have appropriate statistical methods been used? (e.g., Split half-reliability coefficients should not be used with speeded tests as they will produce artificially high estimates.)*
2. *What are the reliabilities of the test for different groups of test-takers? How were they computed?*
3. *Is the reliability sufficiently high to warrant using the test as a basis for decisions concerning individual students?*

Predictive Validity

The test adequately predicts academic performance.

In terms of an achievement test, predictive validity refers to the extent to which a test can be used to draw inferences regarding achievement. Empirical evidence in support of predictive validity must include a comparison of performance on the validated test against performance on outside criteria. A variety of measures are available, such as grades, class rank, other tests and teacher ratings.

There are also several ways to demonstrate the relationship between the test being validated and subsequent performance. In addition to correlation coefficients, scatterplots, regression

BEST COPY AVAILABLE A350

equations and expectancy tables should be provided. Questions to ask:

1. *What criterion measure has been used to evaluate validity? What is the rationale for choosing this measure?*
2. *Is the distribution of scores on the criterion measure adequate?*
3. *What is the overall predictive accuracy of the test? How accurate are predictions for individuals whose scores are close to cut-points of interest?*

Content Validity

Content validity refers to the extent to which the test questions represent the skills in the specified subject area.

Content validity is often evaluated by examining the plan and procedures used in test construction. Did the test development procedure follow a rational approach that ensures appropriate content? Did the process ensure that the collection of items would represent appropriate skills? Other questions to ask:

1. *Is there a clear statement of the universe of skills represented by the test? What research was conducted to determine desired test content and/or evaluate content?*
2. *What was the composition of expert panels used in content validation? How were judgments elicited?*
3. *How similar is this content to the content you are interested in testing?*

Construct Validity

The test measures the "right" psychological constructs.

Intelligence, self-esteem and creativity are examples of such psychological traits. Evidence in support of construct validity can take many forms. One approach is to demonstrate that the items within a measure are inter-related and therefore measure a single construct. Inter-item correlation and factor analysis are often used to demonstrate relationships among the items. Another approach is to demonstrate that the test behaves as one would expect a measure of the construct to behave. For example, one might expect a measure of creativity to show a greater correlation with a measure of artistic ability than with a measure of scholastic achievement. Questions to ask:

1. *Is the conceptual framework for each tested construct clear and well founded? What is the basis for concluding that the construct is related to the purposes of the test?*
2. *Does the framework provide a basis for testable hypotheses concerning the construct? Are these hypotheses supported by empirical data?*

Test Administration

Detailed and clear instructions outline appropriate test administration procedures.

Statements concerning test validity and the accuracy of the norms can only generalize to testing situations which replicate the conditions used to establish validity and obtain normative data. Test administrators need detailed and clear instructions to replicate these conditions.

All test administration specifications, including instructions to test takers, time limits, use of reference materials and calculators, lighting, equipment, seating, monitoring, room requirements, testing sequence, and time of day, should be full described. Questions to ask:

1. *Will test administrators understand precisely what is expected of them?*
2. *Do the test administration procedures replicate the conditions under which the test was validated and normed? Are these procedures standardized?*

Test Reporting

The methods used to report test results, including scaled scores, subtests results and combined test results, are described fully along with the rationale for each method.

Test results should be presented in a manner that will help schools, teachers and students to make decisions that are consistent with appropriate uses of the test. Help should be available for interpreting and using the test results. Questions to ask:

1. *How are test results reported? Are the scales used in reporting results conducive to proper test use?*
2. *What materials and resources are available to aid in interpreting test results?*

Test and Item Bias

The test is not biased or offensive with regard to race, sex, native language, ethnic origin, geographic region or other factors.

Test developers are expected to exhibit a sensitivity to the demographic characteristics of test-takers. Steps can be taken during test development, validation, standardization and documentation to minimize the influence of cultural factors on individual test scores. These steps may include evaluating items for offensiveness and cultural dependency, using statistics to identify differential item difficulty, and examining the predictive validity for different groups.

Tests are not expected to yield equivalent mean scores across population groups. Rather, tests should yield the same scores and predict the same likelihood of success for individual test-takers of the same ability, regardless of group membership. Questions to ask:

1. *Were the items analyzed statistically for possible bias? What method(s) was used? How were items selected for inclusion in the final version of the test?*
2. *Was the test analyzed for differential validity across groups? How was this analysis conducted?*
3. *Was the test analyzed to determine the English language proficiency required of test-takers? Should the test be used with non-native speakers of English?*

Recommended Reading

American Psychological Association, American Educational Research Association, and the National Council on Measurement in Education (Joint Committee) (1985), *Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests*, Washington, DC APA.

Anastasi, A. (1988) *Psychological Testing* New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.

Messick, S. (1989) Validity. In R.L. Linn *Educational Measurement, Third Edition.* New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.

Uniform Guidelines on employee selection procedures (1978) *Federal Register*, 43, 38290-38315.

This publication was prepared with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract RR93002002. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions o policies of OERI or the U.S. Department of Education. **Permission is granted to copy and distribute this ERIC/AE Digest.**

ASSESSMENT TOOLS AS REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS

Adult Basic Learning Examination (ABLE)
Adult Placement Indicator (API)
ALS
ALT
ASSET
Bader Reading and Language Inventory
Botel Reading Inventory
Brigance Diagnostic Comprehension Inventory of Basic Skills
Classroom Reading Inventory (CRI)
Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS)
Diagnostic Analysis of Reading Errors (DARE)
Diagnostic Spelling Potential Test
Doran Diagnostic Inventory
English as a Second Language Oral Assessment (ESLOA)
Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests
Kottmeyer
Language Experience Activity
Language Inventory
Laubach Materials
Literacy Assessment Survey (LAS)
Macomb Placement Packet
MEAP
Merrill Linguistic Reading Program
Methodist Women's Reading Test
Metropolitan Achievement Test
MOTT
Oral Reading, Vision, Auditory Discrimination
Pre-GED
Portfolio Assessment
RCDA Paragraphs
Reading Evaluation Adult Diagnosis (READ)
REVRAC
Schonell Graded Word Reading Test

Slosson Oral Reading Test (SORT)
Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test
Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE)
Wepman
Where To Start
Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)
Woodcock Reading Mastery Test

Michigan Literacy, Inc.
P.O. Box 30007 • Lansing, Michigan • 48909-7507